06-29-07

- AND

U.S.P.S. EXPRESS MAIL "POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE" SERVICE DEPOSIT INFORMATION

Express Mail Label No.: EV 924818244 US

pate of Deposit: June 28, 2007

BRINKS HOFER GILSON &LIONE

CS I											·
	IN	THE U	NITE	STATES PAT	ENT AND	T	RADE	MARK C	FFI	CE	,
In re	Appln. of:	Naoki	NARU	SE, et al.							
Appl	n. No.:	10/815	,187				E	xaminer:	Vy	, Hung	Т.
Filed	l:	March	31, 20	004			A	rt Unit:	216	3	
For:		INFORM		I PROCESSING D	EVICE AND	o .					
Attor	ney Docke	t No:	9683	-185							
Mail S Comr P. O.	Stop Amendminissioner for F Box 1450 ndria, VA 223	ent Patents					TI	RANSM	ΊΙΤ	TAL	
Attac ⊠	Attached are: Transmittal (1 pg)(in duplicate); Response to Communication Dated May 30, 2007 (9 pgs); and										
\boxtimes	□ Return Receipt Postcard □ Return Receipt Postcard										
_	alculation:										
	No additiona		quired.								
☐ Small Entity. ☐ An extension fee in an amount of \$ for amonth extension of time under											
	37 C.F.R. §		i amoui	10 b101 a	-1110	,,,,,,	I CALCIIS	ion or time	unde	31	
	A petition or	processir	ng fee ir	n an amount of \$	under 3	37 (C.F.R. §	1.17(_).		
	An additiona	I filing fee	has be	een calculated as sh	nown below	/: 				*****	
					r	4	Sma	II Entity		Not a S	mall Entity
	Claims Rer After Ame			Highest No. Previously Paid For	Present Extra	F	Rate	Add'l Fee	or	Rate	Add'I Fee
Total	25		Minus	24	1		x \$25=			x \$50=	\$50.00
Indep.	3		Minus	3	0	4	X100=			x \$200=	0
First P	resentation of N	/lultiple De	p. Claim			+	+\$180=			+ \$360=	
_						L	Total	\$		Total	\$50.00
•	ayment:		4 - E O	ia an	alaaad						
				is en unt No. 23-1925 in ti		of (¢ 60 00	A copy of t	hic T	Transmitte	al is
\boxtimes	enclosed for			ını 110. 23-1925 III ü	ne amount	OI (φ30.00.	А сору от т	1115 1	ransiiilla	31 15
	Payment by credit card in the amount of \$ (Form PTO-2038 is attached).										
The Director is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional filing fees required under 3 § 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17 associated with this (including any extension fee required to ensure that this paper is timely filed), or to create overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-1925.									this paper		
	- · - · p - j · · · o · ·	, 0,00			Respe	ctf	ully subr	nitted,			
	28, 2007	<u> </u>	Apir N. Penn (Reg. No. 40 767)								
Date	•				Amir N	N. F	∙enn (R¢	ea. No. 40.7	(671		

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service, with sufficient postage, as Express Mail EV 924818244 US in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on June 28, 2007

Date of Deposit

Amir N. Penn, Reg. No. 40,767

Name of applicant, assignee or Registered Representative

Signature June 28, 2007

Date of Signature

Our Case No. 9683/185

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:				
Naoki	NARUSE, et al.)		
Serial No. 10/815,187			Examiner:	Vy, Hung T.
Filed: March 31, 2004			Group Art V	Jnit No. 2163
For:	Information Processing Device and Program)		

RESPONSE TO COMMUNICATION DATED MAY 30, 2007

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the list Mg 2/2012 White All 10815187

page 2 of this paper.

10815187

Remarks begin on page 6 of this paper.

Application No.: 10/815,187 Attorney Docket No.: 9683/185

program is installed or what functions are in the software program. Similarly, the Tanaka reference teaches that in order to execute the program, the user must be authorized. Specifically, the registration information checker 12 confirms whether the user is authorized based on two coefficient codes and a timestamp. *See* col. 6, lines 30-49. Again, the authorization is not based on where the software program is installed or what functions are in the software program. Thus, the Tanaka reference fails to teach, or even suggest, the limitations as claimed. Therefore, Applicants contend that the claims as currently presented are patentable over the cited art.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the newly presented claims are not directed to a different invention. As such, Applicants request reconsideration to find that the Amendment filed on March 8, 2007 is responsive to the Office Action. In the event the Examiner maintains his position that the newly presented claims are directed to a different invention, Applicants present new claim 29, which is identical to originally presented claim 1, and provisionally elect new claim 29 with traverse. Applicants have further presented the argument above (similar to the argument in the response filed on March 8, 2007) directed to claim 29.

If any questions arise or issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below in order to expedite disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Amir N. Penn

Registration No. 40,767 Attorney for Applicant

P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610 (312) 321-4200